REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-26, 28-40 and 42-44 are pending. Claims 22-24, 28-29, 32, 34-40 and 43-44 are amended. Support for the changes to the claims is found in the originally filed disclosure, including the specification at least at page 14, lines 35-39 and page 16, line 29 to page 17, line 2, and the drawings at least in Figs. 3-6. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 22-26, 36-39 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mauger (U.S. 6,937,612) in view of Lunsford (U.S. 2002/0065041); and Claims 28-35, 40, 42 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mauger, Lunsford, and Fujioka (U.S. 6,907,227).

An interview was conducted with Examiner Lebassi on November 9, 2011, to discuss the Office Action, the Advisory Action and the amended claims. Remarks consistent with those submitted herewith were discussed, and the examiner indicated further clarification concerning the claimed features would be beneficial. In particular, it was discussed that amending the claims to recite the wireless data transfer standard is switched while transmitting data without interruption (or seamlessly) would help clarify the distinctions with the cited references.

Applicant thanks the examiner for his time and comments at the interview. In light thereof, in addition to the amendments to the claims previously submitted (and not entered), further changes are submitted herewith to clarify the claimed features.

The claims define aspects of switching from a first wireless data transfer standard to a second wireless data transfer standard. As discussed in the specification at least from [0121] to [0127] as published (with reference to Fig. 5), a transition from the first wireless data transfer standard to the second wireless data transfer standard, in the transfer of data, can be

performed in a seamless manner. That is, data transfer can be performed uninterrupted even

when the data transfer standard is switched.

Specifically, Claim 22 recites, *inter alia*:

> application data receiving in which application commands, application parameters, and application data of the first wireless data transfer standard are received by the first multimedia device from an application of the first multimedia device;
>
> transmitting data from the first multimedia device according to the first wireless data transfer standard by performing connection layer processing in which the application commands, application parameters, and application data are processed by the first multimedia device to obtain respective connection commands, connection parameters, and connection data of the first wireless data transfer standard; and
>
> standard switching from the first wireless data transfer standard to the second wireless data transfer standard, by the first multimedia device, so as to switch from transmitting the data according to the first wireless data transfer standard to transmitting the data according to the second wireless data transfer standard without interruption, including adaptation layer processing in which a standard conversion is performed, wherein the connection commands, connection parameters, and connection data from the connection layer processing are converted into respective processed connection commands, processed connection parameters, and processed connection data according to the second wireless data transfer standard.

The cited references fail to describe or reasonably suggest such features.

The Office Action relies on Mauger to describe the claimed application data receiving

and connection layer processing, citing col. 2, lines 62-67 and col. 6, lines 51-59. While

these sections of Mauger describe aspects of a multimedia communication between two

devices, where traffic can be converted between the devices according to protocols of the

devices, these sections of Mauger do not describe standard switching, as claimed. This

deficiency is most prevalent when considering Claim 28 (and the claims depending

therefrom), which relates to the basis for which a determination to switch is made.

Moreover, returning to the language recited in Claim 22, Claim 22 is directed to

wireless data transfer between a first multimedia device and a second multimedia device, in

which the first multimedia device and the second multimedia device are connected via a

point-to-point wireless connection that is operable according to a first wireless data transfer

standard and to a second wireless data transfer standard. That is, the first wireless data transfer standard is one way to perform the wireless data transfer, and the second wireless data transfer standard is another different and incompatible way to perform the wireless data transfer. The "different protocols" relied on in Mauger are not the same as the standards defined in Claim 22.

The Office Action at page 2 states Mauger describes a service provider which enables conversion between communication protocols used by two devices. However, this does not read on the claim language. Even if one were to modify Mauger to remove the service provider to provide for point-to-point communications while maintaining the conversion provided by the service provider, the conversion would need to be performed by one of the two devices. As a result, the communication established between the two devices would only ever be according to one of the protocols of the devices, where one of the devices performs conversion. There is no teaching in Mauger as to performing any type of switching between the protocols. Moreover, there is no reason on record as to why one would switch between protocols in such a modification of Mauger.

Lunsford fails to remedy the above-identified deficiencies of Mauger. Lunsford does not describe aspects of switching between protocols or standards.

Fujioka is also deficient. Fujioka does not describe aspects of data transfer standards or protocols, but merely describes aspects of active and inactive modes.

To facilitate examination of this application, the examiner's attention is direct to Fig. 3. Here, the structure of the devices performing wireless communication is shown. On the left is a camcorder CAMC, and on the right is a notebook computer NB. A seamless transition when switching between Bluetooth (BT) and (IEEE 802.11b), e.g., is shown.

Here, an application layer 113 obtains data to be transferred, and uses BT commands, etc., to be sent to a connection layer 119. If the BT standard is used to data transmission,

12

then the adaptation layer 117 passes the BT data to the wireless layer 120 without any

conversion. However, when the "second" standard is switched to, the adaptation layer 117

performs conversion to the IEEE 802.11b standard, the result of which is then transmitted.

The NB performs a more-or-less opposite process when receiving the transmitted data.

By such a configuration, data transfer without interruption can be performed when

switching standards because the connection layer 119 does not change its protocol in

accessing data storage of the application layer 113, and both devices are provided with

adaptation layers 117. The above-discussed process is outlined in Figs. 5-6 and discussed at

least at pages 14-16 of the filed specification.

In light of the above, Claim 22 (and any claim depending therefrom) is allowable over

the cited references. Claims 23 and 40 (and any claim depending therefrom), although

differing in scope and/or statutory class, are also allowable over the cited references for

substantially similar reasons to those described above concerning Claim 22. Accordingly, the

rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Since no other issues appear to be pending, it is respectfully submitted this application

is in condition for allowance. Should the examiner disagree, the examiner is encouraged to

contact the undersigned. Otherwise, a timely Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Marc A. Robinson
Registration No. 59,276